THE GEORGE WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY
Washington, D. C.

March 28, 1968

The University Senate

The University Senate will meet on Friday, April 5, 1968, at 2:10 pm, on the sixth floor of the Library.

Agenda:

1) Call to order.

2) Minutes of previous meeting, and Special Meeting.

3) Report of Special Committee elected to mediate a dispute between Professor Gallagher and the administration of the Columbian College - Professor Brewer.

4) Resolution of Committee on Professional Ethics and Academic Freedom. A RESOLUTION TO INTERPRET THE PROVISIONS OF FACULTY PROCEDURE FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF ARTICLE IX OF THE CODE AND ORDINANCES (67/13). Attached.

5) Report of Nominating Committee (Professor Lewis); election of new Executive Committee.

6) Reports of Standing Committees.

7) Period for brief statements by members of the Senate and by visitors.

8) Adjournment.

Frederick R Houser
Frederick R. Houser
Secretary

MINUTES OF A SPECIAL
MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY
SENATE MARCH 20, 1968

The University Senate met in special session at 2:10 pm, Friday, March 20, 1968, sixth floor Library, President Elliott presiding.

Before proceeding to matters listed on the agenda, Professor Wood made the announcement that Professor Perros had been elected to the Presidency of the Southern Conference.

Professor Wood requested the Secretary to read the draft minutes of the last regular meeting of the Senate, as actions of today's meeting would stem from action taken at that meeting. Copies of the draft minutes of the Senate meeting of March 8, 1968, were circulated to members of the Senate.

The chair recognized Professor Hill who asked permission to withdraw his amendment to Resolution 67/11, stating that "at the end of the last meeting we were debating an amendment which was intended to spell out the character and flexibility by which the Calendar applied. While the amendment was purely explanatory and unnecessary, I felt it might expedite debate. The result, however, was more debate." The withdrawal was allowed, and the main motion A RESOLUTION TO ALTER THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR (67/11) was placed before the Senate for action.

Professor Seidelson, in a message from the Dean of the Law School, stated that the Law School had no intention of changing their examination period, but that they would follow the beginning and ending dates of the semesters.

Professor Lewis considered the Law School's action as "very reasonable," and that the Law School was exercising local option, "which should be extended to every school and college in the University." He then moved an amendment to the Resolution:

> That the material following "adoption" in the first line of the proposed resolution 67/11 be amended to read: . . .within the present academic calendar, of a reading, research and problem-solving period whenever in the judgment of the faculty of a School or College its educational program would be improved thereby.

Professor Zuchelli opposed the amendment, and pointed out that it was an established parliamentary procedure that an amendment which in fact reverses the intent of the original Resolution is out of order. He cited as an example the proposition "thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's Resolution. The amendment to strike the word 'not' bringing it to mean thou shalt covet thy neighbor's Resolution." Professor Zuchelli suggested the proper procedure would be to oppose the order, and he asked the Chair for a ruling.

The Chair ruled the proposed amendment out of order.

Discussion to the question followed by Professors Boswell and Reesing.

With the comment that a reasonable period of time had elapsed since the Resolution was introduced, Professor Heller called the question, and Professor Boswell seconded.

Professor Lewis asked the Chair for information on how to introduce an amendment to the Resolution at this time.

Professor Stevens pointed out that the call of the question of the question required a second, and a 2/3rd majority vote of the body before it can pass. The Chair called for a vote of the assembly to decide whether or not to call the question. The result of the vote was: for voting - 11, against voting - 7, and since a 2/3rd majority was not achieved in the vote, the vote to call the question was lost, and debate on the Resolution was continued.

Further discussion followed with Professor Hill expressing his approval of the Calendar reform. Professor Perros stated he would "tend to support" the reform, but he would not, in effect, be representing the majority of his department, and he would vote with a "certain amount of reluctance."

Professor Kramer questioned whether the reform would be binding on the Medical School. Professor Zuchelli replied it would not; the Medical School is not on the present Calendar.

Professor Lewis asked if it were within bounds of parliamentary procedure to require a referendum by the entire Faculty of each School to approve an amendment to this Resolution, to make it effective for that school.

President Elliott replied that "merely as the occupant of the chair may I suggest that I suspect that any action of the University Senate would be appropriately prescribed as subject to, and concurrence by, the Faculties of X schools and colleges, or such other matters as might be appropriately attendant. Certainly if this is the wish of the Senate that the sentiment of the Faculties of the respective schools and colleges be ascertained as part of the action, the action be held in abeyance until these sentiments are ascertained. I would entertain a motion or an amendment appended to the motion of the main Resolution to achieve this."

Professor Lewis then moved an amendment to the Resolution, seconded by Professor Braun:

> By deleting the period after the word pages, and substituting a comma, to be followed by these words: <u>become effective in each school and college of the University when ratified by a majority of the Faculty of that school or college</u>.

Professor Willson suggested a further amendment to Professor Lewis' amendment:

> To delete: <u>a majority of</u>.

Professor Heller spoke against the amendment, saying that he "sees the opening of a sinister factor in the Senate life which can be evoked by any member of the Senate at any time as easily as it was this afternoon to force every issue, small or large, from every committee of the Senate to a detailed, fractionated, representative vote in each school, the result of which may be

conclusive for a specific school's needs, but not necessarily for that of the University's needs, and also one which will in the future, drain the effectiveness of many meaningful results of a committee by constantly having the faculty provide the schools, and then possibly in the future, of the entire University on the plurality or majority vote or any other vote, on all issues. I think the proper way to counteract the intent of a Resolution that may have large faculty disapproval but is put forth in an honest and a forceful manner by a Senate committee, is to attempt to change the Senate committee at the next legally constituted opportunity. I feel somewhat insulted to have to sit here and be told if this amendment does pass, to go back and do what I have already done, namely, canvass, whether it is on a numerically scoring basis, or an informal basis, the faculty of a school to find out what their opinion is.

"I believe then, that the passage of this amendment, while technically possible, is an improper rule. In the long run it will lead to diminishing the effectiveness of the Senate. I would prefer that this Senate vote on the issue one way or another. If it is passed, attempt to alter it. This is something obvious which none of the speakers addressed themselves to; there is nothing in the resolution that specifies longevity for an infinite period of time.

"There is nothing to stop future Senate committees or the present committees, from altering the position if the environment so requires. The way to have a body function properly is to permit the elected members, the members elected by the faculty to represent them in the Senate, speak for them. We must make the assumption that we are here prepared to debate and vote on the issue. I would laugh at the suggestion that a bill coming out from a committee of the United States Senate be passed back for referendum to see if the home constituents are going to back up their Senator or not. We have been voted to occupy a position in the Senate. We keep ourselves informed, we know what our colleagues want, and now we are asked to go back and canvass our colleagues on an issue on which we already know their feelings.

"I believe it is just a delaying tactic which will in the long run erode the effectiveness of this Senate. I therefore, will vote against this amendment."

After further comments to the question by Professors Wood, Schlagel, Willson, Zuchelli and Lewis, Professor Wood called for the question, Professor Willson seconded, voting followed, and the motion to amend the Resolution was lost.

The question of whether to vote on Resolution 67/11 was called by Professor Zuchelli, seconded by Professor Allen, voting followed with the result: for - 19, opposed - 3, and the main Resolution was placed before the Senate for action. The vote followed with the result: ayes - 10, nays - 6, and the RESOLUTION TO ALTER THE ACADEMIC CALENDAR (67/11) was passed.

As provided by item #2 of the agenda, Professor Hill was recognized by the Chair, and he presented A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH A PERMANENT JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND THE STUDENT COUNCIL (67/10).

Professor Hill spoke to the Resolution saying in part that both

the Senate Committee on Student Relationships and the University Committee on Student Life had endorsed the Resolution, as it most nearly served the best interests of the University. He said further that the Student Council had endorsed the Resolution unanimously.

Professor Hill continued that the trend at this University is to Faculty power and not to Student power. He said that he felt the Senate should be aware of Student leadership and points of view; that Students have a right to be heard; and that a Joint Committee such as this one would be, would provide a meeting ground and a forum for Student voices to be heard. Professor Hill moved Resolution 67/10, and Professor Kenny seconded the motion. Considerable discussion to the question followed.

Professor Willson spoke against the Resolution saying his objection was based on politically effective machinery. He felt the University should be governed by its Faculty, and the Senate was the only body representing the Faculty. He said he believed nothing would be gained by Student power attaching itself to the Senate. Professor Willson contended that the provisions of Paragraph E were not needed, and that the provisions of Paragraph F would "weaken" student Government. He said further that the Senate's responsibility was to present the Faculty position, and the Senate should not amend or table the Resolution, but they should vote against it.

Professor Hill replied that in order to be more completely effective the Students' voice should be heard in the Senate. He raised the question of whether the Senate should remain a Faculty body or become a "University" Senate. He stated that if it remained the former it would tend to polarization of the Student Body and the Faculty. He said he felt the President of the University would be ill-advised to take this body's advice if the Students' voice "is not here represented."

Professor Wood asked if Professor Hill would accept an amendment to Section B in order to make clear the Senate should be the judge as to what matters it should refer to the Joint Committee.

Professor Hill moved two amendments, seconded by Professor Kenny, 1) to amend Professor Wood's amendment to Section B; and 2) an amendment to Paragraph D.

Discussion followed with statements to the question by Professors Reesing, Willson, Lewis and Stevens.

At this point the Chair recognized Mr. James Knicely, President of Student Government, who spoke to the Resolution, commenting "it seems if you are going to add to the amendment, it should be in Section G."

Professor Heller moved to table the Resolution until the next academic year Senate meeting, when all interested parties were ready to come to the Senate. No second was heard to the motion to table, and it was lost.

Professor Perros questioned Mr. Knicely to what extent the Student Council President had access to the President of the University or to the Board of Trustees. Mr. Knicely replied that meetings had provided access to the President, and that members of Student Council were going to meet with the Board of Trustees "on Thursday."

After debate, with statement by Professors Allen, Liverman, and Reesing, Professor Perros called for the question on Professor Hill's first amendment, Professor Lewis seconded, the vote was called and the amendment was lost.

More debate followed and the Chair called for the question on Professor Hill's proposed amendment number two, the vote was called and resulted in: opposed - 10, in favor - 7. Amendment to Paragraph D was lost.

Professor Hill asked leave of the Senate to withdraw the original motion on Resolution 67/10 at this time.

The chair called for the question on the withdrawal of Resolution 67/10. The vote resulted in: for- 4, against - 14, and the motion to withdraw was lost.

Professor Perros called for the question on the overall amendment as presented by Professor Wood. The ayes were in the majority and the amendment passed.

Professor Willson moved the passage of the original Resolution 67/10 as amended, the motion was seconded.

Professor Jones stated that as amended, the Resolution was opposite to what the Committee had originally intended, and that the Senate would be remiss to pass it.

The Chair called for the previous question. The vote to close debate was tied: for - 8, against - 8. The Chair voted against, and voting on the question was delayed.

Professor Allen moved an amendment to the end of Paragraph D, of the amended Resolution, seconded by Professor Hill:

> Whenever any matter within the appropriate areas of concern of the joint committee, as herein provided, shall be brought to the floor of the University Senate, the Chairman and Vice Chairman thereof and the President of the Student Council shall be accorded full privileges of the floor of the University Senate during such considerations. Provided, however, that the foregoing shall not be construed to confer membership or voting rights in said body.

The question was called and the amendment was passed.

The question was called on the original Resolution as amended, and was passed.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 4:56 pm.

Frederick R. Houser
Secretary